

REMARKS

This is in response to the Final Office Action mailed on March 20, 2007. Claims 1-23 and 25-27 were pending in that action. With the present response, claims 1 and 12 are amended. The remaining claims are unchanged.

Claims 1-6, 11-14, 20-23 and 35-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0191731 (“the Stewart reference”). Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully submitted in light of the following comments.

The first element of independent claim 1 includes “instantiating a property of a first object as a second object.” With the present response, this claim has been amended to further define the second object as including a reference to a collection of constraint information. As claimed, the constraint information is stored separate from the second object.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited Stewart reference fails to teach or suggest the elements of claim 1 as amended. During prosecution up to this point, the Examiner has pointed to a “DataObject” described in the Stewart reference at paragraph 0038 and 0097. The Examiner argues that the described DataObject is equivalent to Applicant’s claimed second object. However, it is respectfully pointed out that the DataObject described in Stewart includes nothing even similar to a reference to a collection of constraint information stored separate from the object itself. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is in allowable form at least for this reason. Dependent claims 2-6 and 11 are dependent upon claim 1 and are believed to be distinguishable from the cited reference based on a similar rationale. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 2-6 and 11 each recite an individual limitation that neither taught nor suggested by the cited Stewart reference.

Independent claim 12 is somewhat similar to independent claim 1. The third element of claim 12 states “forming an object of at least one property.” In rejecting this element of claim 12, the Examiner again points to the DataObject described in the Stewart reference. With the present response, Applicant has amended claim 12 to clarify that identifying constraint information comprises referencing a reference stored within the object. As claimed, the reference is indicative of constraint information stored outside of the object. At least for reasons similar to

those described above in relation to independent claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the DataObject is distinguishable from the claim limitations as amended. It is respectfully submitted that independent claim 12 is in allowable form at least for this reason. Claims 13, 14, 20-23 and 25-27 are dependent upon claim 12 and are believed to be similarly distinguishable from the cited Stewart reference. Further, it is respectfully submitted that each of these rejected dependent claims recites an element that neither taught nor suggested by the reference cited against it.

On page 10 of the Office Action, claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,389,414 (“the Delo reference”) in view of the Stewart reference. On page 11 of the Office Action, claims 7-10 and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Stewart reference in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,859,919 (“the Deffler reference”).

It is respectfully submitted that the Delo and Deffler references do not remedy the failure of the Stewart reference to teach or suggest the elements of claims 1 and 12 as amended. Specifically, these additional references fail to teach or suggest, in the context of claim 1, that the second object includes a reference to a collection of constraint information stored separate from the second object. Further, in the context of claim 12, the additional references fail to teach or suggest referencing a reference stored within the object, the reference being indicative of constraint information stored outside of the object. For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

For all of the reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-23 and 25-27 are in condition for allowance.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: Chris Holt
Christopher L. Holt, Reg. No. 45,844
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

CLH:rkp